



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE DATE OF COMPOSITION OF CAESAR'S *GALLIC WAR*

BY MAX RADIN

The *Commentaries* of Caesar on the Gallic War were known in Rome before the year 46 B.C.<sup>1</sup> The enthusiastic praise of Cicero, so often quoted, was written then, but it indicates that the books had already been in circulation. The actual achievements of Caesar must have been known long before—indeed, almost as soon as they occurred—through his personal letters to individual Romans and his official dispatches to the Senate.<sup>2</sup> There is no other external evidence about the date either of the composition or of the publication of the *Commentaries*.

Now, as is well known, each commentary professes to give the events of a single year. Such a system of composition is something we should expect if these books were in the nature of reports made each year to the Roman people, whom, no doubt, Caesar would regard as his real mandators.<sup>3</sup> And it has often been suggested that that is exactly what the *Commentaries* were—yearly reports to the people, intended to serve rather as the crude materials for a history than as a history properly so called.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, far-reaching inferences as to Caesar's character and the course of events in Gaul have been drawn from this assumed mode of composition.

<sup>1</sup> Cicero *Brutus* 262.

<sup>2</sup> Caesar mentions his letters to the Senate, ii. 35; iv. 38; vii. 90. (In the text as in the notes of this article, unless otherwise specified, references are to books and chapters of the *Gallie War*.) The fact that Caesar mentions no other letters does not mean that he did not communicate more frequently. His collected letters to the Senate, to Cicero, and to his *familiares* were extant in the time of Suetonius (*Divus Iulius* 56). Among the last, or in a special collection in several books, were his letters to his Roman representatives, Oppius and Balbus (Gellius *N.A.* xvii. 9). There are, further, the numerous references in the speech of Cicero, *De provinciis consularibus*, delivered in 56 B.C. and the allusions in Catullus, which are necessarily before 54, and, as the poems were circulated individually, considerably before that date. We may assume further that the *Acta Diurna Populi Romani*, which Caesar himself instituted (Suetonius *Div. Iul.* 20), reported the events in Gaul shortly after they occurred.

<sup>3</sup> Hirtius *B.G.* viii. 48, "scio Caesarem singulorum annorum singulos commentarios confecisse."

<sup>4</sup> Cicero *Brutus* 262, "dum voluit alios habere parata unde sumerent qui vellent scribere historiam"; Hirtius, viii. pr., "qui sunt editi ne scientia tantarum rerum scriptoribus desit."

That each commentary was written separately and published separately has been held by critics and historians at various times. But recently the prevailing view has been that this was not the case—that Caesar wrote the entire seven books at the same time, using, of course, his notes, diaries, dispatches, or other memoranda that had been made at various times. It is further held that the time of composition was the winter of 52–51, just after the great rebellion of Vercingetorix.<sup>1</sup>

This theory, which I shall hereafter call the accepted view, is based upon no external testimony. A passage from the preface of Hirtius to the eighth book, “ceteri enim quam bene atque emendate, nos etiam quam facile atque celeriter eos perfecit scimus,” is often cited in support of it.

It ought, however, hardly be necessary to point out that this statement of Hirtius says nothing about the time of composition and is as consistent with the hypothesis that the commentaries were written separately as with the supposition that they were all written at the same time and published at the same time.<sup>2</sup>

But, as has been said, the opposite view is the prevailing one, although a dissertation by Chr. Ebert (Nürnberg, 1909) has in a sense reopened the matter by setting forth the arguments in favor of separate composition and publication with unusual learning and acumen.<sup>3</sup> A new examination of the whole topic may therefore seem permissible.

In the absence of external evidence, there are two passages in the *Commentaries* (I. i. 28 and iv. 21) that are often relied upon to show

<sup>1</sup> In his exhaustive study of the Gallic War Mr. T. Rice Holmes fully examines the question of the time of composition, as he does all other questions connected with it (*Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, p. 162). Although he holds the accepted theory, Mr. Holmes recognizes that the passage from Hirtius does not support it.

<sup>2</sup> A. Köhler (*Bl. f. d. bay. Gymn.*, XXVII, 710–15) believed that the commentaries were written in two instalments, I–IV and V–VII. Köhler's article was not accessible to me, and I have accordingly had no opportunity of examining his arguments. The whole question is discussed by G. A. A. Hecker, *Queest. de Comm. Caes. de Bello Gallico* (Gröningen, 1888), and Walther, *Über die Echtheit und Abfassung der Schriften des Corpus Caesarianum* (Grunberg, 1903). All historians of the time refer to the matter to some extent. Cf. also Teuffel-Schwabe, *Geschichte der röm. Lit.*, p. 380, n. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Über die Entstehung von Cäsars "Bellum Gallicum"* Inaugural dissertation, Nürnberg, 1909.

that Caesar must have written the books in which they are found after the entire war was finished.<sup>1</sup>

In i. 28 appears the statement: "Quibus [Boiis] illi [Haedui] agros dederunt quosque postea in parem iuris libertatisque condicionem atque ipsi erant receperunt."

In the first place, the mere use of *postea* gives us no clue whatever as to when the grant of full citizenship was given to the Boii. It may well have taken place within a few months after the battle of Bibracte. But, as a matter of fact, the statement is really better evidence against than for the accepted view.

When we meet the Boii again in Book vii, we find them not at all on a par with the Haeduans, but Haeduan clients. They are called *Haeduum stipendiarii* (vii. 10), and previously the statement is made of the Boii that Caesar had placed them in that dependent relation [*quos*] *Haeduis adtribuerat* (vii. 9).<sup>2</sup>

While the words of i. 28 may be stretched so as to make them reconcilable with vii. 10, it would be vastly more natural to assume that in i. 28 Caesar was under a different impression from the one recorded in vii. 10, and that accordingly these two books were not written at the same time.

In iv. 21 it is said of the Atrebatian Commius: "cuius et virtutem et consilium probabat et quem sibi fidelem esse arbitrabatur." This phrase, it is argued, must have been written after Commius' revolt.

It must be admitted that, except to show that the later rebellion was in Caesar's mind, there seems no special purpose in mentioning, at this point, his confidence in the Atrebatian's fidelity. When Caesar sends Procillus on his hazardous errand (i. 47), he does not stress his assumed faithfulness. Further, the phrase is very much like that used in i. 21 of the astounding scout-captain Considius, "qui rei militaris peritissimus habebatur." There we have unquestionably a phrase introduced after the event in order to apologize for a mistake in judgment.

<sup>1</sup> Those who hold the accepted view admit the existence of contradictions, but usually explain them as due to the fact that Caesar's manuscript was not revised before publication (Holmes, *Caes. de Bello Gallico*, pp. ix-x). That, however, almost implies the separate composition of the commentaries or of groups of them at least in the form of rough drafts.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly the Suessiones, who had been united with the Remi in what was practically a single state (ii. 3), are after the war assigned as clients to the Remi (viii. 6).

This passage is therefore altogether different from i. 28 and does indicate that iv. 21 was written with the events of several years later in mind. That it proves the accepted view, however, we shall find reason to doubt.

Whenever it is attempted to show that what seems to be a single book was really composed at different times or by different men, the general procedure is, first, to show apparent contradiction between the assumed parts or, secondly, differences in style. In this case it is evident that neither group of differences can be fundamental or far-reaching. Under any theory we postulate the same author and the same subject. But it is a common experience that even in such a case the same man may express himself differently at different times, and unless the whole work is carefully revised, contradictions due to uncorrected temporary impressions may well be found.

Ebert, in the work quoted, after rejecting the two passages mentioned, sums up the contradictions that have at various times been noted between the parts of the *Gallic War*. One of these contradictions has already been mentioned. Another concerns the Nervii.

In Book ii, after the Nervian battle, the statement is made (ii. 28): "in commemoranda civitatis calamitate ex sescentis ad tres senatores, ex hominum milibus vix ad quingentos qui arma ferre possent sese redactos esse [Nervii] dixerunt." But three years later the Nervii rise again in a formidable rebellion, and their great numbers are especially referred to (v. 427): "qua quidem ex re hominum multitudo cognosci potuit," etc.<sup>1</sup> It has been asked with justice how the five hundred could within that time have become so considerable an army.

It has been suggested recently by Holmes<sup>2</sup> that the increase is due to the young men who in 57 were too young to fight. That would assume that the army of 54 was principally composed of raw and very young recruits. But the operations of this very army before the camp of Cicero certainly lend no color to such a supposition.

<sup>1</sup> This army, it is true, consisted of Eburones, Nervii, Aduatuci (v. 39). But in v. 42 it is only the Nervii that are mentioned, so that it is evident that they constituted the bulk of the besiegers.

<sup>2</sup> *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, p. 162. The Helvetians after their first crushing defeat had not summoned up sufficient strength to rebel until fully six years had passed. And even then they furnished only eight thousand men (vii. 75).

Indeed, the unusual military skill of the Nervian army elicited Caesar's admiration (v. 52). Besides, by any calculation it would be difficult to make the levies of three years adequate.

A much more plausible suggestion is that the Nervians purposely exaggerated their losses.<sup>1</sup> They had, of course, every reason to do so, since their only hope lay in the clemency of the conqueror. In that case there is no real discrepancy between the facts as they are depicted in Book ii and in Book v. But it does not seem to have been noted that the real contradiction between the two does not lie in the statements of the Nervians, but in the report of Caesar. Whether the Nervians exaggerated or not, Caesar seems to have believed their statement. In the opening words of ii. 28 we read: "Hoc proelio facto et prope ad internecionem gente ac nomine Nerviorum redacto." That is to say, when he wrote these lines, he was under the impression that the Nervians had been virtually exterminated. But if, as is generally held, Caesar wrote the entire work in the winter of 52-51, the Nervian rising of 54 must have been fresher in his mind than the battle of 57, and it is difficult to see how he could have seemed to credit, while writing, a report he knew to be exaggerated.

There is, accordingly, a real contradiction between Books ii and v which neither of the usual explanations fully removes.

Another phrase that is important rather for the state of mind which it implies than for the concrete fact to which it testifies occurs at the close of Book ii: "his rebus gestis, omni Gallia pacata."<sup>2</sup> The word *pacata* does not mean merely that Gaul was at peace, but that it had been subdued. *Pacare* regularly implies a cessation of hostilities under such terms that Roman sovereignty is recognized. It means the *pax Romana*, the *pacis imponere morem* of Vergil.<sup>3</sup>

In ii. 35 we have, accordingly, a statement that Gaul had been reduced. The *hiberna*, the sign of a subjugated province, are established, and the crowning triumph of a fifteen days' *supplicatio* is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Holmes, *op. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sihler, *Annals of Caesar*, p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the phrases *pacem petere* (i. 27; ii. 13), *de pace venire* (iv. 36), *legatos de pace mittere* (iii. 28; iv. 27). The word is discussed in my article, "The International Law of the Gallic Campaigns," *Classical Journal*, XII, 28.

decreed.<sup>1</sup> Even the far-off Aremorican states have surrendered at his mere demand. If we try to put ourselves in Caesar's place in the winter of 57-56, we may readily admit that he had every reason for thinking that his task had been accomplished. We know, of course, that he was mistaken, that so far from being completed his task in Gaul had scarcely begun, but the point is that he not merely had reason for supposing so in 57, but that he talks as though he did. Nowhere else does Caesar use so strong an expression as *pacata omni Gallia*. He ventures later on a *Gallia quieta* (vii. 1) or a *hac parte Galliae pacata* (vi. 5). Rude experience had taught him to understand that mere cessation of hostile movements meant no real submission on the part of the Gallic tribes. Indeed, we can see in iii. 7 something of an apology for his previous overconfidence in the finality of his achievement.

All this is especially hard to reconcile with the supposition that Caesar at the end of seven years of his campaigns wrote the entire work that we have. In the cases cited we have a record of first impressions where *ex hypothesi* we should expect his corrected conclusions. These indications of themselves create a fairly strong *prima facie* case against the accepted view, and are the strongest arguments that have been advanced by those who believe that each commentary was separately written and published. But is this view the only alternative? It seems to me that it is not, that there is another interpretation of the evidence possible, that the facts noticed point rather to the conclusion that the commentaries were written neither as separate books nor as a single work, but in three instalments. Of these the first instalment comprises Books i and ii, written in the winter 57-56; the second, Books iii-vi, written in the winter 53-52; and the last, Book vii, written in the winter 52-51.

That there is a break between Book ii and the rest of the narrative has already been indicated. Caesar could not have written *omni Gallia pacata* at the end of Book ii with the knowledge of subsequent events in mind, nor could he have spoken of the extermination of the Nervii in ii. 28 at the same time that he was preparing to write

<sup>1</sup> Cicero made the motion in the Senate to that effect. *De prov. cons.* 26. The largest number of days previously granted had been ten, to Pompey after the Mithradatic War (*ibid.* 27).

the occurrences of Book v. But there is a still more visible hinge between Book ii and the following books. That is to be found in the intrusion of iii. 1-6, the account of the attack upon Galba by the Alpine tribes.

It is generally admitted that this attack took place in 57 and not in 56, although Book iii is properly concerned only with the events of 56. The explanation generally offered is that Caesar treats of everything after the summer campaign as belonging to the next year.<sup>1</sup> But what justification is there for the statement? Hirtius, viii. 48, makes the following statement: "Scio Caesarem singulorum annorum singulos commentarios confecisse; quod ego non existimavi mihi esse faciendum propterea quod insequens annus L. Paulo C. Marcello coss. nullas habet magnopere Galliae res gestas."

This seems to show clearly enough that *annus* for Caesar means the civil year, and indeed it would require strong argument to show that an annalistically divided narrative like the *Commentaries* took the word in any other sense. So Books iv and v, though they strictly begin with the events of the winter, make specific reference to the fact that the time is after the inauguration of the consuls.

That becomes especially apparent in v. 55-58. This attack on Labienus took place in the winter of 54 (cf. *totius hiemis*, v. 55). If the explanation mentioned for iii. i-6 is adopted, there is the same reason here that existed there for placing the account, not at the end of Book v, but at the beginning of Book vi. But Caesar does not do that, simply because he is separating his events strictly by the calendar year, and the attack on Labienus seems to have occurred before January 1, 53.<sup>2</sup>

In Book iii the events seem to have occurred before January 1 of the year to which the commentary is devoted. The simplest explanation is, of course, that ii was already completely written when the escape of Galba from Octodurus was reported to Caesar.

There are also certain slight confusions as to detail, which might well be expected if, as is here urged, the space of four years intervened between the composition of the second and that of the third

<sup>1</sup> Sihler, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> This view is strengthened by the considerations advanced below concerning the attack on Commius by Labienus. Caesar probably wrote iii-vi in the early months of 52 rather than in the fall of 53.



book. In ii. 34 it is said that Crassus was sent with a legion to Brittany. When, we are not told, but it seems to have been before the Nervian battle. In iii. 7 the legion under Crassus' command is said to be the seventh, which took part in the Nervian battle and suffered so severely that it can scarcely have been sent north after the battle. Again, in ii. 35 it would seem that Caesar left for Italy and Illyricum before the report of Galba reached him. In iii. 7 he seems to have left after receiving it. These are in themselves slight matters, but they are of confirmatory value.

Just as there is a cleavage between Books ii and iii, so there is one between vi and vii. For that there is a single indication, but one that seems to me conclusive.

The last words of Book vi are: "frumento exercitui proviso, ut instituerat, in Italiam ad conventus agendos profectus est." The first words of Book vii are, "Quieta Gallia, Caesar, ut constituerat in Italiam ad conventus agendos proficiscitur." Since we start with the definite information that, whenever Caesar wrote, he wrote rapidly, we must assume that the second of these two sentences was written directly after the first. It is necessary merely to place them in juxtaposition to see how extremely unlikely that assumption is. Nowhere else, either in Caesar or in other writers, do we find at the beginning of a book a sentence which almost verbally repeats the concluding sentence of the previous book. But that might very well happen if Book vii were written at a time considerably after Book vi were finished.

It may be argued that such resuming sentences would be much more common in extant writers if it were not for the careful revision that their works received before publication. But the practice of ancient writers would lead to an inference precisely contrary to that. If we assume the commentaries to have been written consecutively, we have all the more reason to be surprised at the presence of such a resuming sentence, precisely because the commentaries were in all likelihood not carefully revised before publication. We have in Cicero's treatise on the *Laws* an example of a work that was probably published unrevised, and here we see that the writing is in fact continuous, and the separation into books purely mechanical.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Teuffel-Schwabe, *Geschichte der röm. Lit.*, p. 342.

There is nothing remotely like the instance, noted here in Book vii, of a sentence that itself plainly indicates the end of one and the beginning of a new book. In the *Commentaries*, similarly, if we set together the last chapter of Book i and the first chapter of Book ii, we shall see at once that the narrative is continuous and that the only break is the mechanical one of chronology. The same is true of Books iii and iv, iv and v, v and vi. But there is a break in the narrative between ii and iii and between vi and vii.

Besides the absence of a break between the books just cited, there are other indications, both in substance and in style, that the commentaries are to be grouped as is here argued. One of them is to be found in the use of the word *supra*.

In such phrases as "*uti supra demonstravimus*," etc., the rendering of the word by the English word "above" seems a precise equivalent. Both words are properly used when we wish to refer to something stated before without exactly specifying where it has been said. Generally this thing has very recently been stated, sometimes a few lines before. So *supra* in v. 2 refers to something stated in v. 1; vi. 34 refers to vi. 31; vii. 83, to vii. 80. But it need not be so closely connected with the passage to which it refers. In v. 56 *supra* is used to refer to an incident which has not been mentioned since v. 3.

But whether the incident referred to is near or remote, it must be apparent that *supra* is not likely to be used except to refer to something that the writer recalls having written as part of the composition in which he was then engaged. And while such a limitation of the use of *supra* would be quite unconscious, it would be none the less effective.

With this fact in mind, we meet the passage (vi. 35): "*Sugambri a quibus receptos ex fuga Tencteros atque Usipetes supra docuimus*." But this incident has been last referred to in iv. 16, where the Sugambri deny to the Romans any jurisdiction beyond the Rhine. Accordingly, if the considerations urged above have any validity, Books iv and vi formed part of a single composition.

Similarly the phrase in ii. 1, "*uti supra demonstravimus*," which refers to i. 54, shows a similar connection between Books i and ii.

When Caesar wishes to refer to something he had written before which did not form part of the composition in which he was then

engaged, he seems to prefer the adverb *ante* or some more specific statement. We have, for example, a reference in v. 6 to Dumnorix, who has not been mentioned since Book i. He is recalled in the phrase "de quo ante dictum est." Again, Caesar has twice occasion to refer to the heroic centurion Baculus, who so distinguished himself in the Nervian battle. In iii. 5 it is said: "P. Sextius Baculus primi pili centurio quem Nervico proelio compluribus confectum vulneribus diximus," and vi. 38 we have "[Baculus] cuius mentionem superioribus proeliis fecimus." If ii and iii were written consecutively, the account of Baculus found in ii. 25 would be very close indeed to the second reference to him, in iii. 5.

I may mention another matter, which in itself has but slight probative force, but is better understood if we assume that Books i-ii were written at a different time from the rest of the work. That is the curious disappearance of Diviciacus. Diviciacus is one of the chief characters of Books i and ii, and one can readily assume that he is intentionally made so. He was a well-known figure at Rome, where the old Druid impressed and interested society somewhat as Benjamin Franklin did the court of Louis XVI. He saves his treacherous brother Dumnorix. He secures the pardon of the Bellovaci. He is the general spokesman for all the Gauls.<sup>1</sup> Now, after a complete silence since Book i, Dumnorix suddenly reappears in v. 6. To outsiders his reconciliation with Caesar is complete. His relations are apparently so intimate that he can plausibly boast that Caesar offered to make him king of the Aeduans. But of Diviciacus never a word. The latter, no doubt, died between 57 and 54, but if Caesar wrote all the commentaries in 52 and cherished the memory of Diviciacus as fondly as he seems to do in Books i-ii, surely we might expect some brief reference to him when his trouble-making brother is killed; whereas, if Books i-ii were written in 57, during Diviciacus' lifetime, and Books iii-vi in 53, we can readily understand the importance of Diviciacus in the first part and the practically complete silence about him thereafter.

A further consideration is the striking and vivid detail with which every move of the Helvetian and German campaigns is given. The embassies back and forth, every abortive move, hesitations

<sup>1</sup> i. 20, 31, 32, 41; ii. 14.

over a swamp, are fully set forth. In Books iii-vi, however, it may be noted that wherever full returns are given it is of a campaign, not of Caesar himself, but of one of his lieutenants. That is true of the escape of Galba, of the expedition of Crassus, of the massacre at Aduatuca.<sup>1</sup> In all these cases Caesar in 53-52 had at his command full reports from the men who conducted the campaigns. In the case of Aduatuca, refugees had reached Labienus, and it is doubtless his report to Caesar that is communicated to us.

In sharp contrast with his fulness of detail in the campaigns of his lieutenants is the short and summary way in which his own campaigns are treated. Caesar may or may not have kept an actual diary, but there is no evidence that he transcribed it or did more than refer to it for the sequence of events. It is particularly the campaign of 56 that is described in this summary way. And yet this campaign was one that might naturally be supposed to need a detailed narration. It was unique in Caesar's career. It was his first naval battle, and it was fought under conditions that made it different from any other battle that the Romans fought. In spite of that, this bizarre struggle, involving the lively chase of the enemy from one fortified place to another, is related in three short chapters.

All this is easy to understand if the campaign of 56 was the most remote in time when Caesar wrote about it. It is much harder to understand if it was less remote than that of 58, in the narration of which apparently no detail has been omitted.

So far we have been noticing discrepancies in substance. It remains to be seen whether we can detect those slight differences in style that may be expected under the theory suggested here. Are there such differences?

No one can have failed to observe one very striking stylistic peculiarity of Books i and ii. That is the use of *oratio obliqua* or "indirect discourse." This construction, to be sure, is one of the commonest in Latin, but it is generally used casually and in short sentences. In the books mentioned, particularly in the first, we have long chapters wholly in that construction, especially where the practice of historical narrative would have demanded a set speech.

<sup>1</sup> v. 38. Caesar learned of the massacre directly from Gallic captives (v. 52), but the first reports from Roman survivors had been brought to Labienus (v. 47).

Professor Sihler has suggested that Caesar's use of *oratio obliqua* is due to his haste in composition.<sup>1</sup> But is *oratio obliqua* really easier to write than *oratio recta*? That seems decidedly unlikely. Caesar does not shrink from the use of *oratio recta*, not only in such a case as the long speech of Critognatus (vii. 77), but on several other occasions.<sup>2</sup>

Now, it is important to insist upon the fact that no other writer of Caesar's time, or before him, as far as we can judge, uses *oratio obliqua* as Caesar uses it. Chapter after chapter is wholly or almost wholly so written, e.g., i. 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 40, 43, 44, 45; and ii. 1, 3, 4, 14, 31, and, in part, 32. And just as characteristic as it is of Books i and ii, just so little characteristic is it of Books iii-vi. In those books nearly twice as great an amount of text is found as in Books i-ii, and here only two chapters, v. 27, 29, contain *oratio obliqua* on anything like the scale attempted in i-ii. Nor is that wholly due to difference of subject-matter, as is shown by the fact that *oratio recta*, i.e., the actual quotation of another's words, does occur not infrequently. In many of these passages the practice of Books i-ii would almost certainly have demanded *oratio obliqua*.

In Book vii, again, there is a certain amount of *oratio obliqua*. This amount, it is true, is much less than Books i-ii show. Not only that, but *oratio obliqua* in Book vii is combined with *oratio recta* in a way that produces a definite effect. A long chapter mostly in *oratio obliqua* (vii. 20) is closed with a sentence in *oratio recta*, and immediately thereafter another passage follows in *oratio recta*. Similarly chapters 37 and 38 of the seventh book have very similar matter, the former in *oratio obliqua*, the latter in *oratio recta*. There is, in other words, an apparently deliberate mixing of the two ways of reporting thought which may well be called a stylistic peculiarity.

It may be asked whether we can gain any hint as to what caused Caesar to adopt and to abandon the marked use of *oratio obliqua* that is found in Books i-ii.

<sup>1</sup> *Classical Review* (1890), pp. 1999-2000.

<sup>2</sup> iv. 25; v. 30; v. 44; vi. 8; vi. 35; vii. 20; vii. 38; vii. 50. In Books i-ii there is not a single instance of *oratio recta*, although there is ample occasion for it.

One of the cardinal principles of interpretation is that a writer is best explained from himself. The author of the *Commentaries* on the Gallic War was also, we may remember, the author of *De analogia*.<sup>1</sup> The subject of that short treatise was what we commonly call accident, but *analogia* is only one of the many divisions of rhetorical study, and Caesar was unquestionably interested in the whole subject. As a matter of fact, he regarded the special subject of his treatise as dealing with only the foundation of literary pursuits. The aim he consciously set himself was "cogitata praeclare eloqui posse."<sup>2</sup> The most famous of the phrases quoted from the *De analogia* is concerned, not with accident, but with diction.<sup>3</sup>

Not only was Caesar the author of the *De analogia*, but he wrote that book during these very Gallic campaigns.<sup>4</sup> It was, accordingly, just at this time that he was most concerned with matters of form and style. We are specifically told that it was composed during the winter, in Cisalpine Gaul.<sup>5</sup> Now, *De analogia* is essentially a work of erudition. The many citations demand a library and, still more, a mind free from care.<sup>6</sup> At what time do these conditions seem to have been present?

<sup>1</sup> The fragments of the *De analogia* are collected in the Teubner edition of Caesar (Kübler III, 2, pp. 141 f.). They may also be found in Lorsch, *Sprachphilosophie der Alten*, I, 131 f.; and Schlitte in a Hallensian dissertation, *De C. Iulio Caesare Grammatico*, p. 12. In an article in *Classical Philology*, I, 96-120, Professor G. L. Hendrickson analyzes the *De analogia* and comes to the conclusion that it was written in 54, as a direct answer to Cicero's *De oratore*. That it was a controversial work seems highly likely (Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 116), but in at least one case it is Varro, and not Cicero, against whom Caesar is polemizing; Pomp. *Comment. art.* "Don." (Keil, *Gram. Lat.*, V, p. 199, 13. The verbal similarities which Professor Hendrickson adduces suffer from the weakness inherent in all such evidence, i.e., the subjective element in their evaluation.

<sup>2</sup> Cicero *Brutus* 72, 253.

<sup>3</sup> The phrase referred to is mentioned by Gellius N.A. i. 10. 4: "ut tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum."

<sup>4</sup> Suetonius *Divus Iulius* 56; Fronto (ed. Naber), p. 221.

<sup>5</sup> Suetonius *loc. cit.*: "in transitu Alpium, cum ex citiore Gallia conventibus peractis ad exercitum rediret." We may question the absolute accuracy of the words *in transitu Alpium*. The date assigned to the *De analogia* has varied from 55 to 52, but there is nothing in the extant evidence to show that 55 is the earliest possible date.

<sup>6</sup> The various possibilities of inflection quoted by Caesar are scarcely likely to have been quoted from memory. As has been said before, there seems to have been a polemical tone in the book, and Caesar set himself up as the champion of the purest Latinity. That did not exclude the possibility of bold innovations, as the attempt to introduce a present participle for *sum*, i.e., *ens*.

In the winter of 58-57 Caesar was considerably disturbed by rumors and reports from Belgium. Preparations for the very serious campaign of the next year must therefore have kept him thoroughly occupied. In 56-55 occurred the invasion of Gaul by the Germans and a similar absorption in military preparations. In 55-54 the winter was spent in planning a new invasion of Britain. In 54-53, as we are expressly told, he knew that grave troubles were brewing in Gaul. The following winter, that of 53-52, he found Italy in the terrific turmoil of the Clodian riots. There is, accordingly, only one winter that seems to have presented the apparent tranquillity necessary for such studies as are presented in the *De analogia*—that of 57-56. He was then at ease about Gaul, as he unequivocally tells us. The rebellion was a sudden one.

If the *De analogia* was written in 57-56, and Books i-ii of the *Gallic War* in the same interval of repose, it would be perfectly natural to find any rhetorical experiment just at that time. And these long chapters of oratio obliqua are so different from the usual practice of Latin prose writers that they may properly be called a rhetorical experiment. We need only call attention to the clumsy and involved phrases of i. 14 and 40 to see the strain to which Caesar put himself in order to carry out his experiment. Since Caesar demonstrably possessed that ease of expression which is perhaps the most nearly essential characteristic of a fine style, it is reasonable to regard these labored chapters as deliberate departures from his normal method of expression.

The use of the infinitive in oratio obliqua is thoroughly idiomatic in Latin, and it is quite in Caesar's manner to expand an idiomatic use as it is done in Books i-ii. Rhetorical science made it almost obligatory for historical composition to introduce set speeches. What Caesar seems to have done in the first part of his account of the Gallic War is to depart from this custom by attempting to substitute for the carefully composed oration what doubtless appeared to him a more thoroughly Latin construction.

In a sense, the experiment was a failure. At any rate Caesar found the effort of carrying it through too great for him, when he wrote rapidly, as he did the second part of his work (Books iii-vi), in the agitated winter of 53-52. But he did not altogether lose his liking for the crabbed but original device he has attempted. In

the *Civil War* he recurs to it. And here again we notice that he does not sustain it. The novelty had worn off, or he was compelled to hurry the writing of Books ii-iii of the *Civil War*, or, it may be, as is argued here for the *Gallie War*, Book i of the *Civil War* was written at a different time from the other books. At any rate, while oratio obliqua is used in large blocks in the first book of the *Civil War* and there is no oratio recta at all, that is exactly reversed in Books ii-iii, in which oratio recta is frequently used and there is almost no oratio obliqua.<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, Caesar's experiment did not commend itself to Latin writers. It is only Tacitus who in a measure adopts it. And it made his rhetorical fortune. As much as anything else, it gives him that peculiar somber sententiousness that has so deeply impressed posterity.<sup>2</sup>

In the *Cäsarstudien* of Alfred Klotz (Teubner, 1910), pp. 11 f., the assertion is made that oratio obliqua was a characteristic of the "commentary" style—the Greek *ὑπόμνημα*—and was therefore to be expected in Caesar's *Commentaries*, according to the rhetorical rules governing that style.<sup>3</sup> But for his assertion he neglects to offer any evidence, and it is completely invalidated, as a general rule, by the fact that oratio obliqua characterizes only a very small part of the *Gallie War*, and that in the other parts oratio recta, which in Klotz's view is excluded from the *ὑπόμνημα* style, is freely used. Klotz further states that the whole principle of the *ὑπόμνημα* is completely abandoned in the *Civil War*, and that this abandonment accounts for the large number of speeches in oratio recta occurring there. However, the first book of the *Civil War* contains a great deal of oratio obliqua. And if oratio obliqua rather than oratio recta characterized the *ὑπόμνημα* style, as distinguished from narrative history proper, what are we to say to Tacitus, who certainly *εἰ τις καὶ ἄλλος* knew what was, and what was not, rhetorically meet and proper?

<sup>1</sup> As typical examples contrast *Bell. Civ.* i. 85 and ii. 32.

<sup>2</sup> There seems to be very little discussion of this element in the style of Tacitus. It is barely mentioned in Dräger, *Syntax and Styl des Tacitus*. Cf., however, Justinus, 28, 2; 38, 3, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Ph. Fabia, *De Oratationibus quae sunt in com. Caesaris de Bello Gallico* (Paris, 1889).



Against all that has been urged there are two matters that need special examination. One is the point involved in iv. 21, which has already been referred to. It seems clear that when in that passage Caesar wrote of Commius, "quem fidelem sibi arbitrabatur," he had in mind the subsequent actions of Commius. Now, the defection of Commius is related among the events of 52 (vii. 76) with direct reference to the first British invasion.<sup>1</sup> That would militate against the theory here advanced, that vii was composed at a different time from iv. However, when we examine the whole history of Commius, the difficulty disappears. Commius not merely turns against the Romans, but becomes one of the most intensely hostile and bitter leaders of the insurrection. That this was a sudden change of heart is not likely, and it would be natural to suppose that in the three years between 55 and 52 there had been more than one symptom of his wavering faith. Indeed, we need no conjectures on this score. Hirtius (viii. 23) tells us of the treacherous attack that Labienus made upon this same Commius. When did that attack take place? It is told after the account of the Vercingetorix rebellion, and it might be assumed to have occurred after that time. That, however, is impossible. Hirtius says that it took place "superiore anno [Hirtius is writing of 51] Caesare in Gallia citeriore ius dicente." This could not have been after the rebellion of Vercingetorix, in the winter of 52-51, because Caesar did not go to Cisalpine Gaul that winter, but stayed at Bibracte (vii. 90)—a fact further confirmed by Hirtius (viii. 51) when he says, speaking of the year 50: "tum primum enim veniebat [sc. in Galliam citeriorem] ab illo universae Galliae bello."

The attack on Commius by Labienus must therefore have occurred before the great revolt, in the early months of 52. But the mere fact that Labienus attempted in this way to secure his person itself shows that Commius' disaffection must have been proven by a whole series of acts and was probably known to Caesar throughout the whole winter of 53-52. At any rate, it surely was known in the early months of 52, and at some indeterminable time within this very period Books iii-vi, according to the theory here advocated, were composed. When Caesar wrote iv. 21, he may therefore have

<sup>1</sup> Note, however, *ut antea demonstravimus*, not *supra*.

had excellent evidence that the Atrebatian whom he so implicitly trusted in 55 was either openly disloyal or of doubtful loyalty.

The second matter is one that involves the whole question of the credibility of Caesar's narrative. That has often been attacked. In general, it may be said that the attack rests upon certain expressions of Asinius Pollio. But not only Pollio's criticism, but certain animosities that the character of Caesar has excited in much later times have led to the assertion that Caesar was not only guilty of suppression and perversion, but that he was especially prone to assume the credit of his lieutenants' achievements. For example, to take a specific instance, it is often stated that the victory over the Tigurini was accomplished by Labienus and not by Caesar, who claims it for himself (i. 12). This statement is first made by Plutarch, who may have derived it from Timagenes and Pollio.<sup>1</sup> If that is so, it gives color to the supposition that Book i—and, therefore, the entire *Gallie War*—was composed after 52, when Caesar had begun to doubt the loyalty of his great marshal and had a special motive for wishing to rob him of such glory as was to be gained from the surprise and massacre on the left bank of the Saone.

To determine this rightly, we must take some position on the whole question of Caesar's credibility. Even those who question it hesitate to assert that Caesar deliberately lied. He glossed over defeats, we are told, suppressed details, gave a different impression to the narrative, but hardly more than that. Yet, if it was Labienus who commanded the Romans on that occasion, Caesar cannot be acquitted of falsehood, for he unequivocally says that he himself destroyed the Tigurini. It is therefore simply a question of balancing the testimony of two witnesses.

That of Plutarch—coming perhaps through Pollio, a hostile critic—is no doubt based upon a claim made by Labienus himself. And if Labienus accompanied Caesar on this occasion, the basis for the former's claim becomes at once apparent. And surely it is easier to charge Labienus with bragging than Caesar with falsehood. If Caesar had really wished to claim for himself the credit of what

<sup>1</sup> A Klotz, "Der Helvetierzug," *Neue Jahrb. f. das kl. Altertum*, 1915, pp. 610–11. This article, as the *Gallie War* itself, was written while the author was in the trenches of the western front, literally *inter tela volantia*.

Labienus had done, it would have been easier to do it at many other points, all of them vastly more important than the Arar affair. By the mere omission of a few words nothing need have been said of the fact that Labienus' timely aid turned the tide of battle in favor of the Romans (ii. 26). Labienus plays so prominent a rôle throughout the whole narrative that it seems a little absurd to hold that Caesar was either jealous of him or ungenerous toward him. On the contrary, at least one of Caesar's suppressions is made to protect Labienus. The treacherous attempt of his lieutenant to kill Commius is wholly omitted, although it had serious consequences, and must have been known to Caesar when vii. 76 was written.

It is accordingly Caesar, and not Pollio-Timagenes-Plutarch, who is the more deserving of belief on this question. Nor has any other evidence of unfairness to Labienus been discovered.

I cannot pretend that the arguments advanced above are wholly conclusive. If there were in the external evidence a direct statement that negated them, that statement would doubtless outweigh them all. But there is no such direct statement. The view I have called the accepted one depends upon considerations that are purely *a priori*. A certain burden of proof, however, properly rests upon all who suggest a new view, even if the older one is based upon nothing better than traditional acceptance. It is submitted that in the foregoing sufficient evidence has been adduced to shift the burden upon the proponents of the accepted opinion.

NEWTOWN HIGH SCHOOL  
ELMHURST, NEW YORK CITY